

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed January 26, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mazor et al. (US Pub. 2002/0001365). The Examiner next rejected claims 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh (USP 5,416,815) in view of Mazor et al.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-7 and 18-23, Mazor et al. discloses an x-ray detector for x-ray reflectometry (XRR). Mazor et al. discloses that XRR is well-known in the art as a “technique for measuring the thickness, density and surface quality of thin film layers deposited on a substrate.” ¶2. As shown in Fig. 1 of the patent, XRR involves the projection of x-rays toward a substrate. The reflectance of x-rays off that substrate are then detected and measured to determine layer thickness, density and surface quality. As such, as show in Fig. 1, in XRR, the x-rays that are detected are not those that pass or are attenuated by an object to be imaged. In fact, XRR, by definition, is directed to the detection of x-ray reflectance; not x-rays that have passed through or attenuated by an object to be imaged. Moreover, XRR is not directed to the imaging of an object. XRR is directed to determine characteristic qualities, such as thickness, density, and surface quality, for a thin film layer on a substrate.

In this regard, the claims 1 and 18 have been amended to further define the invention as being directed, in part, to the detection of x-rays that have passed through or attenuated by an object or subject to be imaged. Accordingly, it is believed the amendments made herein further define the invention over the art of record.

Claims 8-17 stand rejected based on the combination of Hsieh and Mazor et al. The reliance on Hsieh is limited to the general components of a CT system. Mazor et al. is relied upon for its teaching of a special-type x-ray detector. However, Applicant believes the Examiner has not established that one skilled in the art would be motivated to replace the detector assembly of Hsieh with one of the type used for XRR. Specifically, the Examiner has not shown a suggestion in the references themselves to use a CT system for XRR or to equip a CT system with a detector used for XRR. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 8 to clarify that the

detected x-rays are those that are attenuated by a subject to be imaged. While Applicant believes the context of the claim implies that the x-rays detected are those attenuated by the subject; nonetheless, Applicant has amended the claim for purposes of clarification. It is not believed that the amendment to claim 8 is necessary to define the invention over the art of record.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-23.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Mark Wilkinson/

J. Mark Wilkinson  
Registration No. 48,865  
Direct Dial 262-376-5016  
jmw@zpspatents.com

Dated: March 3, 2006  
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.221

**P.O. ADDRESS:**  
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC  
14135 North Cedarburg Road  
Mequon, WI 53097-1416  
262-376-5170